

## REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 9, 2008. Claims 28-47 are presented for examination, of which Claims 28 and 38 are in independent form. Claims 18-27 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter presented therein, and new Claims 28-47 have been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 28 is directed to a method for providing standardized input interface elements using Extensible Markup Language (XML). A request for a webpage is received. A first file corresponding to the webpage is received. An XML tag is obtained from the first file, where the XML tag includes data to be formatted according to an input interface element. The XML tag is used to obtain a formatting instruction from a second file. The data is formatted according to the formatting instruction. A third file is generated including the formatted data and the input interface element. The third file is transmitted using a network.

Among the notable features of Claim 28 are that the method includes obtaining an XML tag from the first file, where the XML tag includes data to be formatted according to an input interface element; using the XML tag to obtain a formatting instruction from a second file; and formatting the data according to the formatting instruction. By virtue of these features, a system implementing the method of Claim 28 can provide standardized user interface input elements in web pages.

Nothing has been found in the prior art of record that is believed to teach or suggest “obtaining an XML tag from the first file, wherein the XML tag includes data to be formatted according to an input interface element; using the XML tag to obtain a formatting

instruction corresponding to the input interface element from a second file; formatting the data according to the formatting instruction,” as claimed in Claim 1.

Independent Claim 38 includes features similar to those discussed above. Therefore, Claim 38 is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

The other claims in this application depend from Claim 1 or Claim 38 and therefore are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 50-3939.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lock See Yu-Jahnes/  
Lock See Yu-Jahnes  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS\_WS 1931936\_2